% AO 120 (Rev. 299)
TO: Mail Ston 8 REPORT ON THE

Mail Sup 8
Director of the U.S. Patent & Trademark Office
P.O. Box 1459
Alexandria, vA 22131-4459
Alexandria, vA 22131-459
TRADEMARK

In Compliance with 35 § 290 and/or 15 U.S.C. § 1116 you are hereby advised that a court action has been filed in the U.S. District Court Northern District of California on the following X Patents or Trademador ILS DISTRICT COLLET OCKET NO. C-10-4270-BZ September 21, 2010 Office of the Clerk, 450 Golden Gate Ave., 16th Floor, San Francisco, CA 94102 ASUS COMPUTER INTERNATIONAL, a California Corporation, and ASUSTEK COMPUTER | DENNIS W. NUSSER, an individual INC., a Taiwanese Corporation PATENT OR HOLDER OF PATENT OR TRADEMARK OR TRADEMARK TRADEMARK NO. 5,531,529 "Pls, See Attached Copy of Complaint" 7.101.101 E-filing 7.354,209 4

In the above-entitled case, the following patent(s) have been included:

In the above—centred case, the following principly have been recluded:

DATE INCLUDED DY Amendment Assessor Cross Bill Other Preading
PATENT OR DATE OF PATENTY HOLDER OF PATENT OR TRADEMARK

2
3
4
5

In the above—confided case, the following decision has been rendered or judgments inseed

DECISION/RUDGEMENT

CLERK (BY) DEPUTY CLERK DATE

Rubard W Winkins (Secrebs 2 1, 2010

Secrebs 2 1, 2010

Secrebs 2 1, 2010

ORIGINAL FILED SEP 2 1 2010 ACCEPTAND W WILDING ACCEPTAND OF THE CONTROL ACCEPTANCE OF THE CONTROL ACCEPTANCE OF THE CONTROL

Attorneys for Plaintiffs

1

4

6 7

8

9

10

13

14 v.

16

17 | 18 | 19 | 20 | 21 |

24 25 26

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION

-1-

ΒZ

ASUS COMPUTER INTERNATIONAL, a California Corporation; and ASUSTEK COMPUTER INC, a Taiwanese Corporation,

Plaintiff.

DENNIS W. NUSSER, an individual,

Defendants.

CV 1 0 4270

COMPLAINT FOR DECLARATORY JUDGMENT

DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL

COMPLAINT FOR DECLARATORY JUDGMENT

Civ. No.:

3

5

6

8

Q

10

13

14

16 17

18

19

20

24

26

NATURE OF THE ACTION

 This is an action for declaratory judgment of non-infringement and invalidity of United States Patent Nos. 5,531,529 ("the '529 Patent"), 7,101,101 ("the '101 Patent"). and 7,354,209 ("the '209 Patent") (collectively, "the Patents").

THE PARTIES

- Plaintiff ACI is a corporation organized and existing under the laws of California, with its principle place of business at 800 Corporate Way, Fremont, CA 94539
- Plaintif ASUSTeK is a corporation organized and existing under the laws of Taiwan, with its principal place of business located at 15, Li-Te Road, Peitou, Taipei 112 Taiwan.
- On information and belief, Mr. Nusser is an individual residing at 512 N.
 Victoria Terrace, Fort Lauderdale, FL 33301. Mr. Nusser purports to be the inventor and owner of the '101 patent, the '529 patent, and the '209 patent.

JURISDICTION AND VENUE

- This action arises under the Declaratory Judgment Act, 28 U.S.C. §§ 2201
 et seq., and under the pattent laws of the United States, Title 35 of the United States Code.
 This Court has jurisdiction over this action pursuant to 35 US.C. § 282 and 28 U.S.C.
 §§ 1331, 1338(A), and 2201-2202.
- Venue is proper in this District under 28 U.S.C. §§ 1391 and 1400(b) because a substantial part of the events giving rise to the claims at issue occurred in this District.

 -2-

5

6

8

9

14 15

16

18

19

20

23

25 1

26

This Court has personal jurisdiction over Mr. Nusser by virtue of the business activities, patent enforcement efforts, and other activities it has conducted within the State of California and within this District, resulting in sufficient minimum contacts with this forum.

INTRADISTRICT ASSIGNMENT

This case is an Intellectual Property Action under Civil Local Rule 3-5(c) and shall be assigned on a district-wide basis.

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

- The '529 Patent is titled "Input Apparatus Scaled for Non-Adults and Adults Having Small Hands" and it issued on July 2, 1996 from an application filed on January 26, 1995. On information and belief, Mr. Nusser is the sole inventor and owner of the '529 Patent. A true and correct copy of the '529 Patent is attached as Exhibit A.
- The '101 Patent is titled "Input Apparatus for People Having Small hands" 10. and it issued on September 5, 2006 from an application filed on August 31, 1994. On information and helief. Mr. Nusser is the sole inventor and owner of the '101 Patent. A true and correct copy of the '101 Patent is attached as Exhibit B.
- 11. The '209 Patent is titled "Input Apparatus for People Having Small Hands" and it issued on April 8, 2008 from an application filed on July 28, 2006. On information and belief. Mr. Nusser is the sole inventor and owner of the '209 Patent. A true and correct copy of the '209 Patent is attached as Exhibit C.
- In March of 2008, ACI received a letter from Mr. Nusser saying that he owned the '101 and '529 patents. In that letter, he said that the ASUS Eee 701 and Eee 900 notebook computers "fall within one or more claims of my patents." A true and correct copy of this letter is attached as Exhibit D.
- Between the spring of 2008 and the fall of 2010, ACI, ASUSTeK, Mr. Nusser, and Mr. Nusser's attorney communicated by telephone and email regarding Mr.

5

8

Q

10

18

20

21 22

23 24 25

26

Nusser's allegations that Asus computers infringe Mr. Nusser's patents, and about the invalidity of those patents.

On September 21, 2010 Jacky Lu of ASUSTeK received an email from Peter Herman, counsel to Mr. Nusser. In that email, which was part of a long email string, Mr. Herman states "we have not heard from you, therefore, at this point we must move forward to pursue a lawsuit" and "we are in the process of preparing the complaint." A true and correct copy of this email string is attached as Exhibit E.

(Declaratory Judgment o on-Infringement and/or

ASUS re-alleges and incorporates by reference Paragraphs 1 through 14 as if fully set forth herein.

16. As a result of the acts described in the foregoing paragraphs, there exists a substantial controversy of sufficient immediacy and reality to warrant the issuance of a declaratory judgment.

- An actual and justiciable controversy exists between ASUS and Mr. Nusser as to whether the '529 patent is infringed by ASUS and/or its customers. A judicial declaration is necessary and appropriate so that ASUS may ascertain its rights regarding the Patents
- An actual and justiciable controversy exists between ASUS and Mr. Nusser 18. as to whether the '529 patent is valid. A judicial declaration is necessary and appropriate so that ASUS may ascertain its rights regarding the Patents.

COUNT II (Declaratory Judgment of Non-Infringement and/or Invalidity of the '101 Patent)

ASUS re-alleges and incorporates by reference Paragraphs 1 through 18 as if fully set forth herein.

4

6

7

8

9

13

16

18

19

21

23

24

25 26

- As a result of the acts described in the foregoing paragraphs, there exists a substantial controversy of sufficient immediacy and reality to warrant the issuance of a declaratory judgment.
- 21. An actual and justiciable controversy exists between ASUS and Mr. Nusser as to whether the '101 patent is infringed by ASUS and/or its customers. A judicial declaration is necessary and appropriate so that ASUS may ascertain its rights regarding the Patents.
- 22. An actual and justiciable controversy exists between ASUS and Mr. Nusser as to whether the '101 patent is valid. A judicial declaration is necessary and appropriate so that ASUS may ascertain its rights regarding the Patents.

COUNT III (Declaratory Judgment of Non-Infringement and/or Invalidity of the '209 Patent)

- ASUS re-alleges and incorporates by reference Paragraphs 1 through 22 as if fully set forth herein.
- 24. As a result of the acts described in the foregoing paragraphs, there exists a substantial controversy of sufficient immediacy and reality to warrant the issuance of a declaratory judgment.
- 25. An actual and justiciable controversy exists between ASUS and Mr. Nusser as to whether the '200 patent is infringed by ASUS and/or its customers. A judicial declaration is necessary and appropriate so that ASUS may ascertain its rights regarding the Patents.
- 26. An actual and justiciable controversy exists between ASUS and Mr. Nusser as to whether the '209 patent is valid. A judicial declaration is necessary and appropriate so that ASUS may ascertain its rights regarding the Patents.

- WHEREFORE, ASUS respectfully requests that judgment be entered in its favor and prays that the court grant the following relief:
 - A declaration that ASUS's products have not infringed and do not infringe, either directly or indirectly, any valid and enforceable claim of the Patents;
 - A declaration that the claims of the Patents are invalid;
 - C. An order enjoining Mr. Nusser or his agents, counsel, servants, employees, or all persons in active concert or participation therewith, from charging infiringement of, or instituting any action of infringement of, the Patents against ASUS and/or arv of ASUS's customers:
 - D. An order declaring that ASUS is the prevailing party and that this is an exceptional case under 25 U.S.C. § 285, and an award of its reasonable attorneys' fees, expenses, and costs in this action; and
 - E. Such other further relief as this Court may deem just and proper.

DEMAND FOR A JURY TRIAL

 Pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 38(b) and Northern District of California Rule 3-6(a), ASUS respectfully requests a jury trial on all issues so triable.

Respectfully submitted,

K & Boyd

TURNER BOYD LLP Karen I. Boyd, SBN #189808 2625 Middlefield Road, #675 Palo Alto, CA 94306 Telephone: (650) 924-1475

Attorneys for Plaintiffs, ASUSTeK Computer Inc. and Asus Computer International

Dated: September 21, 2010